

## REMARKS

The above-referenced application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's Final Office Action dated 16 June 2004. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include the subject matter of canceled Claims 2 and 12 respectively. Claim 1 is essentially Claim 2 in independent form and Claim 11 is essentially Claim 12 in independent form. Claims 3 and 13 have been amended to depend from Claims 1 and 11 respectfully. Claims 9, 10 and 19 have been canceled without prejudice. As such, the claim amendments do not raise new issues that would require further search and consideration. Accordingly, the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections in view of the above amendment and following remarks is respectfully requested.

### **Declaration 35 U.S.C. § 131:**

In accordance with the Office Action Applicants' Affidavit under 37 CFR § 1.131 has been disallowed for reasons stated on pages 2-4 of the office action.

With respect to Office Action's disallowance of the Affidavit under 37 CFR § 1.131, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action's statement that the affidavit is deficient. However, Applicants reserve the right to submit further evidence in support the antedating of the MediaNet referece.

### **Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103:**

In accordance with the Office Action Claims 1-19 stand rejected for reasons stated on pages 4-12 of the office action. Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections, Applicants submit that at the very minimum amended Claims 1 and 11 are patentable over the cited references.

As stated earlier Original Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include the elements of Claims 2 and 12 respectively. Therefore, Applicants will address the patentability of Claims 1 and 11, with regard to the rejections of Claims 2 and 12 as set forth in the Final Office Action.

Against original Claims 2 and 12, Page 7 of the Office Action cited the combination of **Benitez, Ortega and Natsev**. The Office Action stated that **Benitez** and **Ortega** do not teach the claimed element, "...one or more library modules adapted to store said data from said one or more data sources...". However, the Office Action cited **Natsev** in, "...figure 1, section 1.2 paragraph 3, page 3 – page 4, paragraph 1, 'The Concept Library is ...terminology'", as teaching this element. Applicants' respectfully disagree with the citation of **Natsev**.

The cited section of **Natsev** discusses modifying a Concept Library using a variety of methods including the use of "optional domain-specific plug-in modules". These modules do not describe the "...one or more library modules adapted to store said data from said one or more data sources...", as essentially recited in claims 1 and 11. Thus, **Natsev** fails to teach this claimed feature. As stated above, the Office Action acknowledged that neither **Benitez** nor **Ortega** teach the feature either.

Accordingly, Claims 1 and 11 are believed to be patentable and non obvious over the combination of **Benitez, Ortega and Natsev**.

Moreover, all pending claims the depend from Claims 1 and 11 are believed to be patentable over the cited references at least by virtue of their dependence from their respective base claims.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

  
Aniket Patel  
Registration No. 55,525

Correspondence Address:

F. Chau & Associates, LLP  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury NY, 11797  
(516) 692-8888  
FAX (516) 692-8889